

THE
PERFECTED SYSTEM
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

AN
IDEAL POLICY
to provide for Death Duties.

Maximum
Insurance
at
Minimum
Cost
is given under the Perfected
Maximum Table.

Full particulars on application to

LEGAL & GENERAL
LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

Total Assets - - £11,000,000.
Income, 1915 - - £1,390,000.

LOANS.

These are granted in large or small amounts on Reversionary Interests of all kinds and other approved Securities and transactions will be completed with a minimum of delay.

HEAD OFFICE: 10, FLEET ST., LONDON, E.C.

The Solicitors' Journal
and Weekly Reporter.

(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)

LONDON, OCTOBER 7, 1916.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE:

£1 6s.; by Post, £1 8s.; Foreign, £1 10s. 4d.

HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

* * The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

CURRENT TOPICS	761	COURT PAPERS	767
THE PASSING OF SUMMER TIME	764	WINDING-UP NOTICES	772
NEW ORDERS, &c.	764	CREDITORS' NOTICES	III
OBITUARY	766	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	III
LEGAL NEWS	766		

Current Topics.

The Coming Term.

THE LONG VACATION will be over before our next issue goes to press, and the new term will be upon us. We fear that it is not likely to be a very prosperous one for the legal profession. Only one of the three Divisions is busy nowadays; the Admiralty judges with Prize Court work and the Divorce Court with *in forma pauperis* causes—neither of which are of profit to the average barrister or solicitor. The diminution of work in the Chancery Court was hidden last year by the fact that the whole energies of Mr. Justice Eve were taken up with one trial of record length. The King's Bench had no arrears—an almost unexampled event in its history. Lack of capital to litigate and the absence of so many vigorous young men, both solicitors and laymen, in His Majesty's Forces are inevitable causes of a slump in legal business.

The Michaelmas Cause List.

THE COURT OF APPEAL list for the Michaelmas term accentuates the reduction of appeal business which has marked the last few years. The Michaelmas figures for 1913, 1914 and 1915 were 363, 308 and 236 respectively, and now they are 181. Thus in the four years the number has been just halved, though, as is natural at the beginning of the legal year, there has been a slight recovery since Trinity Sittings, when the number was 164. The present total includes eighteen Chancery and 134 King's Bench appeals, so that the King's Bench Division continues to furnish by far the greatest part of the appeal business, and the reduction in the list is no doubt mainly due to the special efforts made to clear off arrears in these appeals. The Workmen's Compensation appeals are only sixteen, and in the ensuing sittings the Court is not likely to be taxed so heavily as usual with the subtle problems to which the Workmen's Compensation Act gives rise.

The High Court List.

IN THE Chancery Division business seems to be fairly well maintained. At Michaelmas in the years referred to above—1913, 1914, 1915—the numbers were 368, 328 and 348. Now the total in all the Chancery Division courts is 301; at the beginning of the last sittings it was 273. Considering how the time of Mr. Justice Eve has been taken up by the Rhodesian gold mining case, it might have been expected that the figure would have been swollen by arrears; but there appears to be the usual amount of business, subject to a slight reduction, due probably to current events. In addition to the above, there are forty-one company matters, which represents about the average for recent sittings. In the King's Bench

Division, while the figures are not up to those of a few years ago, there is a marked recovery. For the years 1913, 1914 and 1915 the total causes were 841, 676 and 498 respectively, but the figures for 1913 included 131 revenue cases, which, we believe, largely proved ineffective. Last sittings there was a further drop to 251. For the Michaelmas Sittings the total is 599, which is made up of 142 Divisional Court matters, 449 actions, and eight bankruptcy matters. The lists for the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division are not yet available, but the most significant feature in the lists above referred to is the increase in the King's Bench business, in particular the increase in the number of actions for trial—from 151 at the beginning of last sittings to 449 now. A year ago at this time it was 373.

Solicitors and the Future.

ONE QUESTION which thoughtful lawyers are beginning to consider is the inevitable changes which the future will bring about in the activities of our profession. Such changes are bound to come; that is one of the invariable results of a great war. For war inevitably destroys capital and therefore, to a certain extent, reduces an old country to the status of a new one until it has had time to recuperate and build up its civilization once more. Now there are three great characteristics of a new country, such as Canada—to take the nearest example. It is full of new enterprises. It is in great need of capital. There is less specialization in it; the professions are businesses, are not marked off so clearly from one another. Thus in British Columbia, before the war, a solicitor was generally a great many things besides a mere lawyer. He was usually an estate agent, who helped in the development of land and minerals; a financial agent, who brought the farmer in touch with the banker and the investor; and, in a small way, a stockbroker as well. Moreover, he not infrequently abandoned his own practice to enter business or run a mine. Something of the kind, *mutatis mutandis* of course, we expect to happen in England. The solicitor of the future will tend to be less of a legal adviser and a conveyancer, more of an estate agent and a man of business than he has been in the past. Some of us, who love the old ways of the *ancien régime*, will regret the change. But changes cannot be prevented by those of us who would prefer the rôle of a *laudator temporis acti*.

The Non-Creation of New Silks.

ONE EVENT which usually precedes the advent of Michaelmas Term, the creation of new King's Counsel, is necessarily absent this year. No one will criticize the decision of Lord BUCKMASTER, announced last year in reply to a letter of the Attorney-General, that during the war he will not create new silks. Of course, every rule is subject to exceptions, and an extraordinary case might arise which would lead to an isolated abandonment of this principle. But, generally speaking, it is certainly only fair to the large number of promising juniors who are absent with the forces that new patents conferring rank within the Bar should for the present be withheld. The chance of the junior is when the leaders of the junior Bar take silk. But, indeed, practice has so much diminished in the High Court that—apart from this decision of Lord BUCKMASTER—it is doubtful whether a wise junior, either on the common law or on the equity side, would choose this moment for voyaging across that unknown bourne which separates silks from juniors, and over which no promising junior, once he has crossed it, can return.

The Morality of the Advocate.

SOME DISCUSSION in the public Press has followed the publication of Mr. PURCELL's Reminiscences, which we noted last week. Mr. PURCELL has frankly confessed that he did his best to win his cases by every honest means which legal etiquette permits to the advocate, and that in many cases he succeeded in securing a favourable verdict for accused persons of whose guilt he himself felt little doubt; although, at the

same time, he mentions the fact, also recorded by Serjeant BALLANTINE as his experience of prisoners, that not one of his clients has ever admitted to him that he was guilty. Naturally to the lay critic this suggests the old accusation against advocates, that they help to pervert justice by securing the escape of the guilty or the punishment of the innocent. We do not think that the latter often happens nowadays. The tradition that prosecuting counsel should act fairly, recently endorsed emphatically by the Court of Criminal Appeal, is a strong one at the English Bar, and offences against it are rare. We cannot say that no breach of this honourable tradition ever occurs, for now and then—usually in a private prosecution—a zealous counsel, too eager for triumph, allows himself to ride for a verdict of guilty. But such cases are rare and are universally condemned by the public opinion of the Bar. They would probably be eliminated altogether if private prosecutions were abolished, as is practically the case in Scotland, and if the practice of granting out Treasury briefs on circuit to counsel whose qualifications are derived from political work rather than the extent of their legal practice was finally abandoned. But the case of defences is different. Here an advocate always will do his best to win the case for his client by every proper means, and it would be prudery to deny that in practice the normal advocate does so. If he did not, clients—whether innocent or guilty—would seek a less pedantic and more enthusiastic advocate.

Theories of Advocacy.

THIS RAISES the old question, what is the proper rôle of the advocate? According to one theory, he is the *alter ego* of the client, whose duty it is to say for his client, and do for his client, all that the client would say and do for himself if he had the necessary fluency, experience and legal knowledge. In a famous passage, which we need not quote once more, Lord BROUGHAM put forward his view of the advocate's duty. Not only justice, but even patriotism, he held to be matters which the advocate must ignore when they conflicted with his duty to his client. This view we regard as wrong, indeed evil. It is degrading to the advocate, whom it renders the mere slave of his client. It is cynical, and treats advocacy as an immoral pursuit dangerous to the ends of justice and the safety of the State. A belief that lawyers in general share this view and act in accordance with it is partly responsible for the distaste with which so many laymen view the legal profession. But high-principled lawyers have never accepted this view of their duty. The true view, we believe, is that an advocate is an assistant of the court. In order that the truth may be discerned where conflicting statements lead to confusion, an investigation which requires a division of labour is necessary. That division of labour is into three parts, like CÆSAR'S Gaul. The advocate for the plaintiff must first collect all the facts and theories which assist the plaintiff and put them clearly before the Court. The defendant's advocate must perform the same office for his client. Then the Court can weigh together the two opposite sets of facts, confident that nothing in favour of either party has been overlooked. The advocate must execute his own part of the task so thoroughly as possible; it is not his business to present the case of the other side. But, at the same time, he must be careful not to pervert the facts or conceal anything which the Court ought to know. Such is, we believe, the true view of the advocate's duty, although it is an ideal not always remembered and attained in practice.

Legal and Equitable Assets.

NEARLY ONE-HALF of the August number of Appeal Cases is devoted to *O'Grady v. Wilmot* (1916, A. C. 231). The House of Lords had here to consider once more, in a concrete case, what is meant by the well-known words in section 9 (1) of the Finance Act, 1894, "property which does not pass to the executor as such"—words which appear so simple but which have given conveyancers such infinite trouble. There were two other points in the case, but this was the principal point. A testatrix had under her marriage settlement a general power

of appointment over the proceeds of some converted realty, and by her will she appointed this to the trustees of the will for sale and conversion. She gave her residuary estate to her husband, whom she appointed her executor, with a direction to pay her funeral and testamentary expenses, debts, and legacies, out of the residue. We cannot discuss at length the points arising out of this disposition, and must confine ourselves to a brief statement of the decision of the Court on each, referring our readers for full consideration of the leading points to our recent article on the "Executor as Such" (*ante*, p. 704). The simplest point was whether this direction to pay "testamentary expenses" out of residue included estate duties as a part of these expenses, and the House held that it did not, although to do so they had to overrule *Re Treasure* (1900, 2 Ch. 648). The next easiest point is whether the will operated as a reconversion of the appointed property so as to pass the property on the death of the testatrix as realty, on the principle laid down in *Re Lord Grimthorpe* (1908, 2 Ch. 675). But the House distinguished that case, and held that the converted realty retained its character of personalty. The third, and most difficult point, on which turned the question whether or not the estate duty is a first charge on the appointed property, was whether it passed to the "executor as such." Put shortly, the conclusion at which the House of Lords arrived was that the test whether or not property passes to the "executor as such" is its character of "legal assets" and "equitable assets" respectively. The former do, the latter do not, pass to the executor as such. And since property appointed by the testator under a general power is not part of his estate at law, recoverable by the executor on the mere production of probate, such property is "equitable," not "legal," assets, and therefore does not pass to the executor as such. This decision of the House of Lords overrules half a dozen leading cases, but had they decided the other way another half-dozen would have been overruled.

Contemporanea Expositio.

IN OUR article last week entitled "Contemporary Explanations of Contracts under Seal" (*ante*, p. 755), a point not directly relevant to the subject of the article was incidentally referred to. After pointing out that, in the present state of the authorities, it is not admissible to construe a modern deed with the aid of contemporary documents shewing that the parties misunderstood its legal effect (*N.E. Railway Co. v. Hastings*, 1900, A. C. 260) a question is raised as to the effect of this doctrine in a peculiar case. Suppose at the date of the deed everybody believed a certain rule to be law, and conveyancers habitually acted on that assumption. Then, let us suppose that a later date judicial decision, applying an old principle more logically or modifying the law in harmony with enlightened modern opinion, overruled the old rule as formerly understood. An example of such action on the part of the Court may be found in such a recent case as *Hewson v. Shelley* (1914, 2 Ch. 13), where the Court of Appeal, overruling Mr. Justice ASTBURY and a host of earlier authorities whom he had felt bound to follow, held that a grant of administration is not rendered void *ab initio* by the subsequent discovery of a will. In this case the Judges of Appeal hardly concealed their view that, owing to its "startling results" (*per COZENS-HARDY*, M.R., at p. 29), the opposite doctrine must be got rid of. Now, in such a case, where subsequent decision has frankly altered the law, is a deed made prior to this judicial revolution to be construed in the light of the law as generally understood when it was made, or in the light of the law as now settled? In principle one would answer that the new rule must be adopted as the canon of construction; to do otherwise would be to treat judicial decisions as if they were Parliamentary legislation. Indeed, this is why Courts hesitate to overrule old decisions on which conveyancers have long relied even when now recognized as unsound. But, apart from this consideration of principle, the point appears really to be covered by authority—although an authority of a rather

curious kind—on an analogous point. In the *Norfolk Peerage Claim* (1907, A. C. 10) the House of Lords had to consider the effect of a charter granted by the Crown in 1312. At that date the law allowed the surrender of a peerage and such a surrender was a link in the claimant's claim of title. Our modern peerage law has long refused to admit the validity of such a surrender. Accordingly the House of Lords held that, even in construing a grant of a peerage made in 1312, one must decide upon its validity, not in accordance with the law as understood at that date, but as understood to-day. The Courts assume, said Lord DAVEY, at p. 16, that the law has been "misunderstood" in former days.

Adjournment of Local Tribunals.

IT IS becoming almost common form for the local tribunals created under the Military Service Acts, when dissatisfied with any act of the War Office or the Executive Government, to adjourn their sittings as a protest. Sometimes they adjourn because single men are still employed in local munitions works, as was the case with the Lanchester Rural District Tribunal the other day, sometimes because they disapprove of the lists of certified occupations, sometimes because they are dissatisfied with the conduct of medical boards, and sometimes because the recruiting officer has refrained from calling up men to whom they have refused exemption. Now, whatever be the merits of such cases, it is clear that it is no part of the duty of the local tribunals to set them right. Their duty is simply to hear properly and determine justly the applications which come before them. Matters of policy are not their business, and they have no more right to comment upon them or try to influence them by a strike than has any judicial or magisterial bench in any ordinary case. Unfortunately, these adjournments cause delay, and put the War Office in a difficulty. We understand that the Local Government Board treats an adjournment as a decision by the tribunal of the cases before it and advises the military representative to enter appeals against such adjournments. The legality of this course seems doubtful. The proper remedy, surely, is an application to the High Court for a *mandamus* directing the tribunal to hear and determine the claims.

The Late Mr. Levett, K.C.

THE DEATH of Mr. LEVETT removes from the Chancery Bar one of its half-dozen "specials." Although not an old man as age goes at the Bar, for he was barely seventy, Mr. LEVETT had not been seen much in the courts of late years, the result of ill-health probably brought on by overwork. In his day, however, he had a great practice as a leader; his sound knowledge of law and untiring industry had gained for him the support of the solidest and best type of Chancery solicitor. Few men have done so well at the Bar with so few of the external advantages of an advocate as Mr. LEVETT. Usually a successful member of the Bar has some striking personal characteristics, either a commanding figure, or an impressive countenance, or exceptional charm of manner and voice, or an artistic and interesting forensic style. Mr. LEVETT had none of these gifts, although his plain common sense, geniality of character, and thoroughly solid attainments were suggested by his appearance. He achieved success because he knew his work, because his labour and care were monumental, and because his absolute honesty and straightforwardness of purpose won for him the marked respect of the judges before whom he practised. He was not a brilliant man, nor what is sometimes vulgarly called "a flyer," but a hard-headed Englishman of the bulldog "John Bull" type, which anthropologists tell us is now showing signs of vanishing.

The Dublin Committee for the Prevention and Relief of Distress has been informed by the Chief Secretary for Ireland of the forthcoming appointment of a committee to consider applications for compensation for loss of life or personal injury sustained accidentally during the late rebellion. It is a condition that there shall have been no default on the part of the person killed or injured and that liability shall not have been admitted by the military or other authorities.

The Passing of Summer Time.

In the early hours of the first day of this month "the prescribed period" defined by the Summer Time Act, 1916, came to an end, and the clocks were put back an hour. Greenwich mean time was restored once again as the time for all general purposes. The Act itself, however, has not expired. An Order in Council may revive its operation; that is to say, a prescribed period, during which the time for general purposes is to be one hour in advance of Greenwich mean time, may be ordained for another year and again for yet another year. The only condition precedent to such a revival of the altered time is that the war should still be continuing at the time when the Order in Council is made. The Act is therefore in one sense still in force.

No Order in Council reviving the operation of the Act can be made until after the commencement of 1917, and a second Order in Council will be necessary to revive it again after the end of next year. If the war ends before the Order in Council is made for next year the statute becomes a dead letter. If, on the other hand, the Order in Council is made shortly before the declaration of peace the Act will continue in force till the prescribed period fixed by that Order has expired. Thus the measure is essentially a war-time enactment. The prescribed period for every future year is to be fixed by the Order in Council. Presumably, however, if His Majesty be advised to make the Order next year, the period during which the time for general purposes will be in advance of Greenwich mean time will terminate on 1st October, and presumably, also, it will be made to commence six months previously.

That it has been an almost unqualified success cannot be doubted. Those who grumbled at having to change their clocks by Act of Parliament, and who foretold all manner of difficulties, have long since been silenced by the very smooth working of the measure. The alteration of time on 21st May was effected without any appreciable inconvenience to anyone. The readjustment of summer time to Greenwich mean time has likewise been effected, with the result that the mornings are warmer and brighter and the evenings colder and darker. It would seem an undoubted fact that much saving in fuel and oil and so forth has been effected. The habits of the people in general have tended towards improvement. The yield from allotment gardens has increased, and would have increased a great deal more, of course, had not such a large number of the cultivators been engaged in military service. All which points furnish a strong argument for the continuance of the policy of the Act after the conclusion of peace.

If a new Act be passed to perpetuate the improvement resulting from the alteration of time, no doubt the main ambiguity in the provisions of the present Act will disappear. This ambiguity occurs in sub-section 3 of the section 1. There are, of course, only two sections. All the operative part of the measure occurs in the first, which is subdivided into five sub-sections. Sub-section 3 enacts that wherever any expression of time occurs in any Act of Parliament, Order in Council, order, regulation, rule or bye-law, or in any deed, time-table, notice, advertisement, or other document, the time mentioned or referred to shall be held, during the prescribed period, to be the time as fixed by the Act. A proviso is then added enacting that where in consequence of the Act it is expedient that any time fixed by the bye-law, regulation, "or other instrument" should be adjusted, and such adjustment cannot be effected except after the lapse of a certain interval or on compliance with certain conditions, the appropriate Government Department may, on the application of the body or person by whom the bye-law, regulation, "or other instrument" was made or is administered, make such adjustment in the time fixed as in the circumstances may seem proper to the Department.

Now, if words mean anything, this proviso *prima facie* applies to a deed or written instrument made between mere individuals, and circumstances may easily be imagined when it might be expedient for at any rate one of the parties to have

the matter adjusted. It is tolerably clear, however, that in such a case there would be no appropriate Government Department, and therefore that the proviso does not apply to that to which at first sight it certainly appears to apply. The wording of this proviso is open to criticism, and might very easily be improved when the Legislature has the matter again under consideration.

The method of legislating by promulgating measures by Order in Council, which is a marked feature of much of this war-time legislation, will no doubt disappear if the policy of the Summer Time Act, 1916, is to find its way into a permanent statute. There are excellent reasons for this form of legislation at such a time as the present, when it is or may be expedient to give a discretionary power to the Executive. These arguments do not hold good in peace time except in particular cases.

New Orders, &c.

War Orders and Proclamations, &c.

The *London Gazette* of 29th September contains the following:—

1. An Order in Council (dated 29th September), made under the Trading with the Enemy (Extension of Powers) Act, 1915, s. 1 (1), amending the Proclamation of 22nd February, 1916, by varying the "Statutory List" of persons and bodies of persons with whom trading is prohibited, in the manner detailed in a Schedule to the Order.
2. An Order in Council (dated 29th September), made under the Customs (Exportation Prohibition) Act, 1914, s. 2, amending various Proclamations of various dates enumerating lists of articles the export of which is prohibited.
3. A Land Registry Notice (made under the Land Transfer Acts, 1875 and 1897, giving a list of persons about to be registered as proprietors of properties with absolute or good leasehold titles.
4. A Winding-up Order of certain businesses (printed below) made under the Trading with the Enemy Amendment Act, 1916.
5. An Admiralty Notice (dated 29th September) announcing proposed distribution of Naval Prize Bounty Money in respect of certain ships, and warning claimants against the ships to send in their demands to the Registrar of the Admiralty Division (printed below).

The *London Gazette* of 3rd October contains the following:—

6. A Proclamation (dated 3rd October) amending the lists of contraband (printed below).
7. A Proclamation (dated 3rd October), made under the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, regulating the importation of arms and other goods into the United Kingdom.
8. An Order in Council (dated 3rd October) amending the Defence of the Realm (Consolidation) Regulations, 1914 (printed below).
9. A Foreign Office Notice (dated 3rd October) varying the lists of authorized consignees in China and Siam.
10. A Winding-up Order of certain businesses (printed below) made under the Trading with the Enemy Amendment Act, 1916.

New Defence of the Realm Regulations.

3rd October, 1916.

Whereas by an Order in Council dated the twenty-eighth day of November, nineteen hundred and fourteen, His Majesty was pleased to make Regulations (called the "Defence of the Realm (Consolidation) Regulations, 1914") under the Defence of the Realm Consolidation Act, 1914, for securing the public safety and the defence of the realm:

And whereas the said Act has been amended by the Defence of the Realm (Amendment) Act, 1915, the Defence of the Realm (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1915, and the Munitions of War Act, 1915:

And whereas the said Regulations have been amended by various subsequent Orders in Council:

And whereas it is expedient further to amend the said Regulations in manner hereinafter appearing:

Now, therefore, His Majesty is pleased, by and with the advice of His Privy Council, to order, and it is hereby ordered, that the following amendments be made in the said Regulations:—

1. After Regulation 2b the following regulation shall be inserted:—

"2a. The Admiralty or Army Council or the Minister of Munitions may by order regulate, restrict, or prohibit the manufacture, purchase, sale, delivery of or payment for, or other dealing in, any war material, food, forage, or stores of any description or any article required for or in connection with the production thereof, and if any person refuses to sell any article, the sale whereof is regulated by any such order, he may be required by the Admiralty or Army Council or the Minister

of Munitions to sell it on the terms and subject to the conditions on and subject to which the sale thereof is authorized by the order.

"If any person fails to comply with any provision of any such order or any requirements made thereunder, or aids or abets any other person, whether or not such other person is in the United Kingdom, in doing anything which, if done in the United Kingdom, would be a contravention of any such order, he shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations, and if such person is a company, every director and officer of the company shall also be guilty of an offence against these regulations unless he proves that the contravention took place without his knowledge or consent."

2. In regulation 6A, for the words "exemption is necessary to secure the carrying on of work which is required in the national interest," there shall be substituted the words "exemption is necessary to secure the carrying on of work, and that such exemption can be granted without detriment to the national interests."

3. For regulation 9A the following regulation shall be substituted:—

"9A. Where there appears to be reason to apprehend that the assembly of any persons for the purpose of the holding of any meeting will give rise to grave disorder, and will thereby cause undue demands to be made upon the police or military forces, or that the holding of any procession will conduce to a breach of the peace or will promote disaffection, it shall be lawful for a Secretary of State, or for any mayor, magistrate, or chief officer of police who is duly authorized for the purpose by a Secretary of State, or for two or more of such persons so authorized, to make an order prohibiting the holding of such meeting or procession, and if a meeting or procession is held or attempted to be held in contravention of any such prohibition, it shall be lawful to take such steps as may be necessary to disperse the meeting or procession or prevent the holding thereof."

"Where His Majesty by Proclamation has suspended the operation of section one of the Defence of the Realm (Amendment) Act, 1915, this regulation shall have effect in any place in the United Kingdom in respect of which the operation of that section is so suspended as if references to a Secretary of State included references to the competent naval or military authority."

"In the application of this regulation to Scotland, references to the Secretary for Scotland and to a provost shall be substituted respectively for references to a Secretary of State and a mayor."

"In the application of this regulation to Ireland, references to the Lord Lieutenant shall be substituted for references to a Secretary of State."

4. At the end of the first paragraph of regulation 11 the following paragraph shall be inserted:—

"Any such order as aforesaid may contain directions as to public lamps being lighted or kept lighted, and if any public lamp is not lighted or kept lighted as required by the order, any person having control of the lamp for the time being shall be guilty of a summary offence against these regulations."

In the third paragraph of the same regulation, for the words "require any lights to be lighted or kept lighted, or require lights on any vehicle to be extinguished," there shall be substituted "require any lights to be lighted or kept lighted, or to be extinguished."

5. In regulation 12A for paragraphs (a) and (b) there shall be substituted the following:—

"as to prevent the use as a searchlight of the light exhibited by any such lamp."

6. After regulation 15A the following regulation shall be inserted:—

"15C. The Admiralty or Army Council or the Minister of Munitions may by order require any person engaged in the production, manufacture, purchase, sale, distribution, transport, storage, or shipment of any war material, food, forage, or stores of any description or of any article required for or in connection with the production thereof to give such particulars as to his business as may be specified in the order, and may require any such particulars to be verified as they may direct, and if any person fails to comply with the order or with any requirement made thereunder, he shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations, and if such person is a company every director and officer of the company shall also be guilty of an offence against these regulations unless he proves that the contravention took place without his knowledge or consent."

"If any person, except as authorized by the Admiralty or Army Council or the Minister of Munitions, discloses or makes use of any information given to him under this regulation he shall be guilty of a summary offence against these regulations."

7. For regulation 35B the following regulation shall be substituted:—

"35B. If any person, having found any bomb or projectile, or any fragment thereof, or any document, map, or other article whatsoever which he has reasonable grounds for believing or suspecting to have been discharged, dropped, or lost from, or to have been carried in or to have formed part of any aircraft or vessel of the enemy, or to have formed part of the equipment or personal effects of any member of the crew of such aircraft or vessel, without lawful authority or excuse neglects forthwith, after finding the same, or, in the case of any such article which was found before the third day of October, nineteen hundred and sixteen, as soon as may be after that date, to communicate the fact to a military post or to a police constable in the neighbourhood, or, on being so required, neglects to send or deliver the same to the competent naval or military authority or some person authorized by him for the purpose, he shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations."

"Where any such article is found at the place where the aircraft in

question or the wreck thereof descended, no person shall, without lawful excuse, displace, remove, or otherwise interfere with such article, and, if any person does so, he shall be guilty of an offence against these regulations."

8. For the first paragraph of regulation 41A down to and including the words "Provided that" there shall be substituted the following:—

"It shall be the duty of every person who in Great Britain employs any one or more male persons between the ages of 18 and 41 (in this regulation referred to as an "employer") to make a list of such persons for the time being employed by him, in the form and containing the particulars mentioned in the table hereinafter contained, and to revise such list as often as may be necessary to maintain its accuracy, and to keep such list constantly posted up in some conspicuous place on the premises in or about which such persons are employed, or if such persons are not employed in or about any premises, then on the employer's premises. If any employer fails to comply with the foregoing provisions, or knowingly makes any false entry in any such list, he shall be guilty of a summary offence against these regulations."

Provided that—

(a) It shall not be necessary to enter on the list the particulars of persons who have not been employed for more than one week, if the employer keeps and produces for inspection when required a record of the names of all such persons (whether still in his employment or not), their ages, the addresses given by them, and the exemptions, if any, from military service granted to them; and

And the provisions marked (a) and (b) in that regulation shall be marked (b) and (c) respectively.

In the second paragraph of the same regulation, after the words "revise such list as aforesaid" there shall be inserted the words "or to keep such a record as aforesaid."

9. For paragraph (c) of regulation 45 the following paragraphs shall be substituted:—

"(c) destroys, makes away with, or by wilful neglect loses any such pass, permit, certificate, licence, or other document or passport, or retains it when he has no right to retain it, or when it is contrary to his duty to retain it, or fails to comply with any directions issued by lawful authority with regard to the return thereof; or

"(cc) allows any other person to have possession of any such pass, permit, certificate, licence, or passport issued for his use alone, or without lawful authority has in his possession any such pass, permit, certificate, licence, or passport issued for the use of some person other than himself, or on obtaining possession of any such pass, permit, certificate, licence, or passport, by finding or otherwise, neglects or fails to restore it to the person or authority by whom or for whose use it was issued or to a police constable; or"

10. For removing doubts it is hereby declared that where under paragraph (5) of regulation 56 it has been determined that a case shall be tried by a court of summary jurisdiction the case may be so tried notwithstanding that the offence was committed more than six months before the institution of the proceedings before the court of summary jurisdiction, and accordingly in that paragraph after the words "not otherwise" there shall be inserted the words "and may be so tried notwithstanding that the offence was committed more than six months before the institution of the proceedings before the court."

New Contraband Proclamation.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE KING MAKING CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO AND AMENDMENTS IN THE LIST OF ARTICLES TO BE TREATED AS CONTRABAND OF WAR.

3rd October, 1916.

Now, therefore, We do hereby declare, by and with the advice of Our Privy Council, that during the continuance of the war, or until We do give further public notice, the following articles will be treated as absolute contraband, in addition to those set out in Our Royal Proclamations aforementioned:—

Insulating materials, raw and manufactured.
Fatty acids.
Cadmium, cadmium alloys, and cadmium ore.
Albumen.

And We do hereby further declare that as from this date the following amendments shall be made in Schedule 1 of Our Royal Proclamation of the 14th day of October, 1915, aforementioned:—

For item 6, "paraffin wax," there shall be substituted "waxes of all kinds."

And We do hereby further declare that the following article shall as from this date be treated as conditional contraband in addition to those set out in Our Royal Proclamations aforementioned:—
Yeast.

Trading with the Enemy Amendment Act, 1916.

Orders have been made by the Board of Trade requiring the under-mentioned businesses to be wound up:—

332. Selsa Co. Limited, 5, Newcastle Street, Hulme, Manchester, Manufacturers of installations for lighting and heating. *Controller:* John P. Garnett, 61, Brown Street, Manchester. 25th September, 1916.

333. Feld Bros. and Co. Limited, 432/433, Mansion House Chambers, Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C., Manufacturers of electric

wires. *Controller: J. E. Percival, 6, Old Jewry, London, E.C. 26th September, 1916.*
 334. P. D. Raspe Sons, Limited, Windmill Lane, Stratford, London, E., Manufacturers of Agricultural Machinery. *Controller: H. Crewdson Howard, 70a, Basinghall Street, London, E.C. 27 September, 1916.*

Naval Prize Bounty Money.

*Department of the Accountant-General of the Navy,
 Admiralty, 29th September, 1916.*

Notice is hereby given to all Persons interested therein, that preparations are now being made for the intended Distribution of the Prize Bounty awarded for the undermentioned services:—

Destruction of "Demir Hissar" by H.M.S. "Wear," "Jed," and "Kennet," 16/4/1915.

Destruction of "Greif" by H.M.S. "Alcantara" and "Andes," 29/2/1916.

Destruction of "Emden" by H.M.A.S. "Sydney," 9/11/1914.

Agents or other Persons having any just and legal demand, unliquidated, against the Award are required to transmit the particulars of any such demand to the Registrar of the Admiralty Division of H.M. High Court of Justice, in order that the same may be examined, taxed, and allowed by that Officer, and paid under the sanction of the Judge of the said court.

Due Notice will be given, by future advertisement in the London Gazette, of the date proposed for the commencement of Distribution, and at the same time, the amount of an Individual's Share in the respective Classes will be announced.

Service at Westminster Abbey.

THURSDAY, 12TH OCTOBER, 1916.

On the occasion of the re-opening of the Law Courts, a Special Service will be held at Westminster Abbey, at 11 a.m., which the Lord Chancellor and His Majesty's Judges will attend.

In order to ascertain what space will be required, Members of the Junior Bar wishing to be present are requested to send their names to the Secretary of the General Council of the Bar, 2, Hare-court, Temple, E.C., before 4 p.m. on Wednesday, the 11th October.

Barristers attending the Service must wear Robes. All should be at the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey (Dean's Yard Entrance), where robing accommodation will be provided, not later than 10.45 a.m.

A limited number of Seats in the South Transept will be reserved for friends of Members of the Bar, to whom one Ticket of Admission (or if possible two) will be issued on application to the Secretary of the General Council of the Bar.

No Tickets are required for admission to the North Transept, which is open to the Public.

FREDERICK SMITH, Attorney-General.

Obituary.

Qui ante diem perit,
 Sed miles, sed pro patria.

Lieutenant-Colonel F. C. West.

Lieutenant-Colonel FRANCIS C. BARTHOLOMEW WEST, R.F.A., who was killed on 29th September, was the only surviving son of the late Rev. C. F. C. West, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and vicar of Charlbury. He was educated at Cheltenham College and St. John's College, Oxford, where he rowed for his college in 1904 and 1905, both in Torpids and Eights. He took his degree in 1905, and was called to the Bar in 1907, but never practised. On the formation of the Territorial Force he received a commission in the R.F.A., and went to the front with his brigade as commanding officer in March, 1915. He married, in June, 1909, Agatha Mary, elder daughter of William Dewar, of Rugby; he leaves a widow and four daughters.

Captain M. L. R. Romer.

Captain MARK LEMON RITCHIE ROMER, K.R.R.C., who died on 20th September on board the hospital ship *Aberdonian*, of wounds received on the 16th, was the elder son of Mr. Mark Romer, K.C. He obtained his commission as Second Lieutenant in November, 1914.

Lieutenant Arthur Urban.

Lieutenant ARTHUR URBAN (East Surrey Regiment), a young Tunbridge Wells solicitor, has been killed in action in France. He was admitted in 1912, and acted as managing clerk to Mr. R. Vaughan Gower. He was the son of Mrs. and the late Mr. Urban, of Godalming, and was articled to Messrs. Lock, Reade, & Co., of Dorchester. In July, 1915, he joined the Inns of Court O.T.C., and received his com-

mission in the East Surrey Regiment three months later. He was stationed at Cork during the recent futile rebellion in Ireland. Shortly afterwards he went over to France, and was slightly wounded while taking part in the British offensive operations.

Lieutenant P. L. Beard.

Lieutenant PHILIP LEO BEARD (Royal Warwickshire Regiment), who was wounded in action, has succumbed to his wounds. Lieutenant Beard, who was the son of Mr. John Beard, of Edgbaston, was called to the Bar at Gray's Inn in 1909, and joined the Midland Circuit. Enlisting as a private, he was soon given a commission, and afterwards promoted to a full lieutenancy, acting for some time as the military representative at tribunals in Warwickshire and Birmingham. He had only been at the front a fortnight when he was wounded. Lieutenant Beard, who was thirty-four years of age, was married eighteen months ago, and leaves a widow and infant son.

Second Lieutenant H. E. E. Coleman.

Second Lieutenant H. E. E. COLEMAN, Royal Sussex Regiment, was educated at Dulwich College and Lincoln College, Oxford, and was called to the Bar a few years later. At the outbreak of war he joined the Public Schools Brigade as a private, and was in the trenches all last winter. He obtained his commission last July in the Royal Sussex Regiment and fell in action on 9th September. He was the eldest son of Mr. and Mrs. E. H. Coleman, of De la Warr-road, Bexhill, and was twenty-seven years old.

Legal News.

Appointment.

The King has been pleased to give directions for the appointment of Mr. THOMAS WAGSTAFFE HAYCRAFT, B.A. (Puisne Judge, Mauritius), to be the Chief Justice of Grenada.

Changes in Partnerships.

Dissolutions.

RICHARD SOWTON BARROW and ERNEST GEORGE CARY CHAPMAN, solicitors (R. Sowton Barrow & Chapman), Dulverton, in the county of Somerset. Sept. 29. The said Ernest George Cary Chapman will continue to carry on the business under the style or firm of R. Sowton Barrow & Chapman.

[Gazette, Oct. 3.]

EDWARD HENRY LEE, ARTHUR MUSGROVE, THOMAS OLIVER LEE, and LESLIE ARTHUR SMITH, solicitors (Lee, Musgrove, & Co.), Birmingham. 30th September, 1916.

General.

A meeting attended by about 1,500 people, the majority of whom were women, was held in Queen's Hall last week in support of the demand for votes for sailors and soldiers on active service. Mr. W. Boosey presided, and the other speakers were Mr. Arnold White, Mr. Leo Maxse, Mrs. Pankhurst, and Brigadier-General Page Croft, M.P. A resolution demanding "the immediate enfranchisement of all fighting men" was adopted unanimously.

At Carnarvon on Saturday the Hon. Frederick Wynn, Glynllifon Park, was summoned for continuing to employ six men at his home farm knowing them to be absentees without leave. Evidence was given that the defendant's head bailiff neglected to apply in time for exemption of the men. When eventually he appealed for leave the tribunal refused, but allowed the men individually to do so. The defence was that Mr. Wynn himself had no knowledge of the men being in his employ. A fine of 40s. was imposed in each case.

At the City Local Tribunal Colonel Stuart Sankey, the City Remembrancer, as head of a division of the Special Constabulary, applied on Monday for the exemption of an "emergency officer," who, he said, was the only man in the division who lived in the City. He did very important work and he would be urgently required in the event of a Zeppelin falling in the City. Replying to the chairman, Colonel Stuart Sankey said the regular police were depending more and more on the Special Constabulary. A postponement of two months was granted.

One of the last measures of the session of the New Zealand Legislature, which ended on 8th August, was a Parliamentary Election Postponement Bill. It prolongs for one year the life of the present Parliament. As a General Election which would be anything better than a sham must involve the breaking up of our National Government, the country is not prepared to face such a possibility during the war. But it was, nevertheless, surprising to find Parliament legislating in August, 1916, for the postponement till December, 1918, of a General Election which is not due till December, 1917, although another session will

intervene. The surprise has been increased by the modest proposal to extend the life of the British Parliament until the end of May, 1917. The postponed date is six months earlier than the unpostponed date of our General Election.—*Times*.

The Minister of Munitions, in the exercise of his statutory powers, has required all persons, firms and companies engaged in the manufacture of cranes, aerial ropeways, capstans, conveyors, grabs, elevators, hoists, lifts, runways, shear legs, transporters, travellers, or winches, whether operated by steam, electric, hydraulic, pneumatic, or hand power, not to carry out without a permit issued under his authority in any factory, workshop, or other premises, any work consisting of the manufacture, assembling, or erection of any of the above-mentioned articles except under:—(a) Orders received from or in connection with work for the Admiralty or War Office; (b) orders of a value not exceeding £50 required for war work; (c) orders which have already been sanctioned by the Ministry of Munitions as Class "A" work.

The "Oxford" Sectional Bookcase is the ideal one for anybody who is building up a library. It is splendidly finished, with nothing of the office stamp about it. The illustrated booklet issued by the manufacturers, William Baker & Co., Ltd., The Broad, Oxford, may be obtained gratis, and will certainly prove interesting to book lovers.—(Advt.)

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature COURT OF APPEAL.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1916.

The Appeals or other Business proposed to be taken will, from time to time, be announced in the Daily Cause List.

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

(General List.)

1914.

Actiengesellschaft Fur Anilin
Fabrication in Berlin and anr v
Levenstein ld (s o until after
termination of war)

In the matter of Letters Patent
granted to Edward Mertens,
No. 17,198 of 1904, and In the
matter of the Patents & Designs
Acts, 1907 & 1908 (s o one
week's notice on either side to
restore)

1915.

In the matter of the Estate of Sir
John E Murray Scott, Bart, dec
Scott v Scott (s o until further
order)

1916.

In the matter of the Bede Steam
Shipping Co ld and In the
matter of the Companies (Con-
solidation) Act, 1908

The British United Shoe Machi-
nery Co ld v Standard Rotary
Machine Co ld

In re Betsy Yates Briggs, dec
Briggs v Briggs and ors

In re Betsy Yates Briggs, dec
Same v same

In re Henry James Williams, dec
Williams v Ball and ors

The Taff Vale Ry Co ld v The
Cardiff Ry Co

Smith v Pearman and ors

In the Estate of Myles B Ken-
nedy, dec Corbould and anr v
M Kennedy and ors

The Mayor, Aldermen and Bur-
gesses of the City of Bristol v
The Great Western Ry Co and
The Midland Ry Co

Andrews and anr v Beetles

Ashburton v The Furniture Trade
Supply Co ld

Albert Lee & Co v Swinden & Co
ld

FROM THE PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

(Final and New Trial List.)

1916.

Probate In re Charles Jeffries,
dec Bliss Hill and ors v
Jeffries and anr

Probate In re Alfred John
Paine, dec De Grey and Paine
v Ellis

Divorce Kay, A M (petnr) v
Kay, K (respt) Hayman, Geo
(intervener), King's Proctor
showing cause

FROM THE COUNTY PALA- TINE COURT OF LAN- CASTER.

(General List.)

1916.

In the matter of the Estate of
Adam Fielding, dec. Wyces v
Lowe (Manchester District
Registry)

FROM THE CHANCERY AND PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISIONS.

(Interlocutory List.)

1915.

Smith v Pearman and ors

1916.

In the matter of the Companies
(Consolidation) Act, 1908, and
In the matter of the Oil Pro-
cesses ld (Canada)

Mawer v Emerson and ors

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(In Bankruptcy.)

In re J F P Yeatman (expte
Henry Miller v The Trustee
and The Debtor), No 863 of
1910

Motion.

In re Bernard Boaler (expte Ber-
nard Boaler v The Official
Receiver and ors), No 918 of
1909

Appeals.

In re W F Halsted (expte H
L S Richardson, The Official
Assignee of The Stock Exchange
v The Trustee), No 1,206 of
1914

In re W F Halsted (expte H
L S Richardson, The Official
Assignee of The Stock Exchange
v The Trustee), No 1,206 of
1914

In re H Hilckes (expte The
Muhesa Rubber Plantations ld
and R W Elder v S Cole, The
Trustee), No 279 of 1914

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Final and New Trial List.)

1914.

The Commrs of Inland Revenue v
Smyth (Revenue Side) (s o gene-
rally)

Hunter v Commrs of Inland
Revenue (Revenue Side) (s o for
Attorney-Gen)

1915.

Walter Morrison v The Commrs
of Inland Revenue (Revenue
Side) (s o for Attorney-Gen)

Bruce, Marriott & Co v Houlder
Line ld (s o liberty to apply to
restore—Feb 8)

United Chemical Works ld v
Sadur Same v same

The King v Additional and
General Commrs of Income Tax
for St Giles and St George's,
Bloombsbury (s o liberty to apply
to restore)

Ounsworth (Surveyor of Taxes) v
Vickers ld (s o generally)

Firth v Faulding (s o notice of
death of debt)

Parson v Nesbitt (s o notice of
death of debt)

Modern Transport Co ld v

Dunorie Steamship Co (s o

till after judgment in House of

Lords in Tamplin's Case)

1916.

The Scottish Navigation Co ld v
W O Souter & Co (s o till after
judgment in Tamplin's Case in
House of Lords)

In re an Arbitration between
Wulfsberg & Co and the Owners
of SS. Riversdale (s o till after
Tamplin's Case in House of
Lords)

In re an Arbitration between The
Admiral Shipping Co ld and
Weidner, Hopkins & Co (to
follow The Scottish Navigation
ld, &c)

In the matter of an Arbitration
between Carruthers & Co ld and
Danon Freres (remitted to Arbitra-
tor and to be retained in
Court No. 2)

Holdsworth, Hongie & Co v Stein,
Forbes & Co ld

Hindley Twist Co ld v Salemo
S V Nevanas & Co ld v Lothbury
Supply

Beechey v E Pollard & Co ld

Hugh Stevenson and Sons ld v
The Aktiengesellschaft fur Car-
tonnagen Industrie

London & South Western R Co v
Gillman & Spencer ld

The Owners of Steamship

"Nolissement" v Bunge and

Born

Moore & Gallop v Evans

Burton v Dresden

Barham v Jarrott

Grundy v Sun Printing & Publish-
ing Assoc

Hitchin & Co v Ripley & Co ld

Northcote v Minister & Co

W Cory & Son ld v Lampton &

Herton Collieries ld

McVittie v Turner

Buchanan v Merton & Ridge

Dix v D Allen & Sons ld

Conway v Cushman

Iredell v General Securities

Corpn ld

Greenoff & Shaw v Leach & Seed

Sheridan & Co v Lancashire Motor

& Engineering Co

In the Matter of an Arbitration

between the Erith Oil Works ld

and Mann & Cook

Pollard v London and Midland

Insee Co ld

Cameron v Marr

The King v The Commissioners for

Income Tax for Romsey Divi-
sion of County of Southampton

(expte W M G Singer)

The King v The Commissioners

for Income Tax for the District

of Kensington (expte P E Singer)

Lowe v Weld-Blundell

Warburton v Co-operative Whole-
sale Soc ld

R Sykes Bailey ld v Yorkshire

Iron & Coal Co ld

Preston v Stockton and ors

Green v All Motors ld

Bolckow, Vaughan & Co v Com

pania Minera de Sierra Menera

North Eastern Steel Co ld v Com

pania Minera de Sierra Menera

Browne v Lewis (Executor of

Waller dec)

Hildyard v McDonald and ors

Blane (married woman) v Francis

(widow)

Ferguson v Runciman and ors

Nash v Rochford Rural District

Council

Limerick Steamship Co ld v A

Coker & Co ld

Horwood v Miller's Timber &

Trading Co ld

The Olympia Oil & Cake Co ld v

The Produce Brokers Co ld

Serkis v Norman

L Embiricos and ors v A A

Embiricos

In re an Arbitration between The

Calico Printers Assoc ld v The

Mayor & C of Stockport

Haigh v Pringle and anr

Same v Same

Wilson, Sons & Co ld v The Barry

Ry Co ld

Gennari and anr v London Mail

ld and anr

Ford v Brynn Hall Colliery Co ld

Keys v Straker-Squire (1913) ld

London & Rochester Barge Co ld

v General Stone and Marble Co

ld

Humphreys v Miller

Johnston v Braham & Campbell

Middard v Motor Petrol Assoc ld

Tucker v Torquay & District

Motor Cap Co ld

Parr's Bank ld v The Union Cold

Storage Co ld

W Cater & Co ld v Compagnie

Generale Transatlantique (In-
corporated)

Rio de Janeiro Tramways Light &

Power Co ld v London American

Maritime Trading Co ld

Henderson, Craig & Co ld v C

Reich & Co

British Murac Syndicate *Id v Lazarus*
E S & A Robinson Id v Alexander and anr
Hood and anr v West End Motor Car Packing Co
Broadbent v E Young & Co Id
Woolcott v Broacha
Shutler v Griffiths
Richards and anr v L Summerfield Id and anr
Leyland Shipping Co Id v Norwich Union Fife Insee Soc
Werner v Herman, Jennings & Co Id
Warde v Crossfield Oil & Cake Co Id
Burbridge v Oak Deposits (1914) Id
Hulton, A M (married woman) v Hulton, E
Hart Bros & Co Id v J Brown & Co Id
The King (on the prosecution of Sir W. H. Dunn) v The Governors of Christ's Hospital
Buchholtz & Co Id v Cassey & Hunter
W Cater & Co Id v W Notman & Co and ors
Murphy v Dowdall & Bros
Morris v Baron & Co
Huntingdon v Walsh
Banbury v Bank of Montreal
Pawson and ors (Exors) v Dore and anr
Armement Adelf Deppe v John Robinson & Co Id and ors
Taback v Bennett
In re an Arbitration between The Guardians of the Poor of the Birmingham Union and The Guardians of the Poor of the Tamworth Union
Same v Same—Meriden Union
Same v Same—Bromsgrove Union
Birch Bros Id v Unic Motors Id
Meux's Brewery Co Id v Ead
White, John (junior) v The Electro Mechanical Brake Co Id
Hardy's Crown Brewery Id (in re The Fountain Inn, Chorlton-on-Medlock) v The Commrs. of Inland Revenue (Revenue Side)
Ferguson, Peter v Commrs. of Inland Revenue (Revenue Side)
Joseph v Reid, Hewitt & Co
Simpson (trading, &c) v Henry Seddons & Sons Id
H A Stevens (Surveyor of Taxes) v E Boustead & Co (Revenue Side)
Hart v Talbot
Comins v Weld-Blundell
Metropolitan Water Board v Dick, Kerr & Co. Id
Sport and General Press Agency Id v Our Dogs' Publishing Co Id
Powell-Cotton v King
The King v Grimaby Section of the Lincolnshire Appeal Tribunal
Holden v Arthur Holden & Sons Id
In re an Arbitration between Power, Son & Co and Ant Cassar & Figli
St Aubyn v Printers &c of the Richmond and Twickenham Times
McVittie v Marsden
Morris v Mynyddislwyn Urban District Council
Briggs, Pollit & Co Id v Bradford Dyers' Assoc Id
Raynham v Morris
Mordaunt v Surie
Fairclough, Dodd & Jones v Same
Sutcliffe v County Tailoring Co Id
Same v Same
Charlton & Bagshaw v Liverpool Grain Storage and Transit

Salter v Powell Jones and the South Wales Engineering Supply Co
Velchand v Atherton

FROM THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (ADMIRALTY).

With Nautical Assessors.

(Final List.)

1916.

The Tolhurst Cement Works Id v Owners of Steamship Jargoan—1915—Folio 749
The Whittable Salvage Co Id and ors v The Owners of Steamship Algarda, her cargo and freight (salvage)
The Owners of the cargo now or lately laden on board the Steamship Evangelistria v Owners of the ship or vessel Evangelistria

(Interlocutory List.)

The Owners of the Steamship Polish Prince v The Owners of the Steamship Lowther Grange—1915—Folio 477
The Owners of the Steamship Baharistan and her cargo v The Owners of the Steamship Phoebe and her freight

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

1916.

Lojo Ausagobolag v Burt, Boulton & Haywood Id (s o liberty to restore)
J Soanes & Son Id (Judgt Creditors) v Papierfabrik Wiessenstein A G (Judgt Debtor) & H Huber & Co (Garnishees) part heard (s o generally)
Robinson v Cinema House Id
Bunge & Co v Rathbone
Hillier v Drummond
Graham v Hart

In re THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACTS, 1897 AND 1906.
 (From County Courts.)

1916.

Frampton v Willesden Paper & Canvas Works Id
Oldfield v Lyons
Round v Wathen & Son
Hammond, Walter v R & W Paul Id
Heathcote v Hunchwood Collieries Id
E Harrison (by his father and next friend, P Harrison) v F J Featherstone
Griffith v Owners of Sailing Ship "Penrhyn Castle"
Robinson v Hall
Harrison v Malton Farmers' Manure & Trading Co Id and anr
Bell v Thos W Ward Id
Lakey v Blair & Co Id
Wardle v H G Enthoven & Sons Id
Anderson v Sir W G Armstrong, Whitworth & Co Id
Mullinger v Bidewell
Jewell v Ansten (1914) Id
Griffiths v Robbins

N.B.—The above List contains Chancery, Palatine and King's Bench Final and Interlocutory Appeals, &c, set down to September 28th, 1916.

HIGH COURT.—CHANCERY DIVISION.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1916.

NOTICES RELATING TO THE CHANCERY CAUSE LIST.

Mr. Justice NEVILLE will take his Business as announced in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice EVE will take his Business as announced in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Liverpool and Manchester Business.—Mr. Justice EVE will take Liverpool and Manchester Business on Thursdays, the 19th October, the 2nd, 16th and 30th November, and the 14th December.

Mr. Justice SARGANT.—Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice SARGANT will sit for the disposal of His Lordship's Witness List throughout the Sittings.

Mr. Justice ASTBURY.—Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice ASTBURY will sit for the disposal of His Lordship's Witness List throughout the Sittings.

Mr. Justice YOUNGER.—Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice YOUNGER will take his Business as announced in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice PETERSON.—Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Actions with Witnesses will be taken throughout the Sittings.

Summonses before the Judge in Chambers.—Mr. Justice NEVILLE, Mr. Justice EVE and Mr. Justice YOUNGER will sit in Court every Monday during the Sittings to hear Chamber Summonses.

Summonses Adjourned into Court and Non-Witness Actions will be heard by Mr. Justice NEVILLE, Mr. Justice EVE and Mr. Justice YOUNGER.

Motions, Petitions and Short Causes will be taken on the days stated in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

NOTICE WITH REFERENCE TO THE CHANCERY WITNESS LISTS.

During the Michaelmas Sittings the Judges will sit for the disposal of Witness Actions as follows:—

Mr. Justice SARGANT will take the Witness List for SARGANT and YOUNGER, JJ.

Mr. Justice ASTBURY will take the Witness List for NEVILLE and ASTBURY, JJ.

Mr. Justice PETERSON will take the Witness List for EVE and PETERSON, JJ.

CHANCERY CAUSES FOR TRIAL OR HEARING.

Set down to September 28th, 1916.

Before Mr Justice NEVILLE

Retained Witness Actions.

In re James Wall Wall v Wall
Franken v Oliver Harper & Co
In re Charles Taylor (London) Id
Miller v Taylor Charles Taylor (London) Id Miller v Findarg
Mercer v Wall
In re H C Davies, a Solr, &c
Pitt v Wilkinson
Drave v The Kleno Manufacturing Co Id and ors
Kleno Manufacturing Co Id v Drake

Further considerations.

Thomas v Richards
Same v Same
In re Sir John Whittaker Ellis, Bt
Prideaux v Ellis

Causes for Trial Without

Witnesses and Adjourned

Summonses.

In re Flimby & Broughton Moor Coal & Fire Brick Co Id and In re Courts (Emergency Powers) Act, 1914 pt hd
In re Rodez Coal Co British Bank of Northern Commerce Id v The Company s o
Parkin v Baker pt hd
In re Robinson Bell v Robinson
In re Isaac Ballin, dec Clodd v Ballin
In re Robert Clarke, dec Aldham v Marvin
In re Mc Lachlan Wall v Carruthers
In re J Tanner dec Hill v Merrett
In re Furze, dec Clarke v Furze
In re Frost, dec Frost v Jeffreys

In re P B Edleston, dec Edleston v Jeffery
In re The Trust Funds of the Society of Old Neuwieders Jackson v Page
In re Moses Solomon, dec Usherwood v Solomon
Walters v White
In re A Thorne, dec Thomas v Campbell-Preston
In re Robert Maynard, dec Rogers v Long
In re Liebert's Settlement Liebert v Chichester
In re Jardine, dec Macgregor v Holder
In re Trench's Trusts Findlay v Beech
In re E F J Deprez, dec Henriques v Deprez
In re Edmund Johnston, dec Prescott v Preece
In re Barnes, dec Barnes v Wellington
In re W H Hill, dec Odgers v Hill
In re F H Atkinson, dec Wardale v Goodhall
Grimwade v Bessell
In re Finucane, dec Finucane v Finucane
The Property & Estates Co Id v Lilley
In re Beaufort, dec Beaufort v Wyllys
In re Jones, dec Charteris v Jones
In re P A S Hickey, dec Beddoes v Hodgson
In re Chas Maude, dec Maude v Maude
In re Vaughan Paynter v Vaughan
In re Daniels Daniels v Woodley
In re Dandridge The Public Trustee v Woodley

In re The Courts (Emergency Powers) Act and in re Wey Valley Wool Works ld
In re Stoddart Wilson v Macrae
In re J Eyre, dec Eyre v Moorat
In re Hayward, dec Hayward v Bell
In re Morris Mayhew v Halton
In re J Raphael's Trust Warburg v Raphael
In re Master, dec Egan v Master
In re Blakeway, dec Wootton v Blakeway
In re Watkinson, dec Watkinson v Watkinson
In re Collett, dec and In re Married Women's Property Act, 1882
In re Collett, dec Collett v Collett
In re Caddick, dec Caddick v Callaby
In re Bastard, dec Gully v Bastard
In re Garratt, dec Carter v Garratt
In re Sir H G Regnart, dec Edwards v Regnart
In re Hall Henderson v Thomson
In re Churchill Taylor v University of Manchester
Halford v Fowler
In re Rankin Lea v Rankin
In re Joseph Abbey's Trusts
Gateshead Guardians v Durham County Council
In re J Richards Richards v Richards
In re Baerselman Culley v Baerselman
In re H P Davies & Sons, Solrs, and In re Taxation of Costs

Companies (Winding Up) and
Chancery Division.

Companies (Winding Up).

Petitions.

Timor Oilfields ld (petn of R H Silley—ordered on Oct 13, 1914, to stand over generally)
Chilian Eastern Central Ry Co ld (petn of A Delimele—ordered on June 15, 1915, to stand over generally)
Tough-Oakes Gold Mines ld (petn of G F S Bowles—ordered on July 6, 1915, to stand over generally)
Paraguay Central Ry Co ld (petn of Frederick J Benson & Co—s o from April 18, 1916, to Oct 24, 1916)
Walter Cawood ld (petn of W R Bisschop and ors—s o from June 20, 1916, to Oct 17, 1916)

Northern Quarries Co ld (petn of Mountsorrel Granite Co ld and anr—s o from July 4, 1916, till 2nd Petition day in Hilary Sittings, 1917)
St Agnes Consolidated Mines ld (petn of Curtis's & Harvey ld—s o from July 11, 1916, to Oct 24, 1916)
British Mercantile & Trading Co ld (petn of Duncan, Flockhart & Co and anr—s o from July 25, 1916, to Oct 17, 1916)
Bull Dog Motor Tyre Syndicate ld (petn of Rosen & Jackson—s o from July 25, 1916, to Oct 17, 1916)
United Electric Theatres ld (petn of New Bioscope Trading Co ld—s o from July 25, 1916, to Oct 24, 1916)
United Electric Theatres ld (petn of Davis & Taylor—s o from July 25, 1916, to Oct 24, 1916)
Freighting & Trading Co ld (petn of Carlos Wigg—s o from July 25, 1916, to Oct 17, 1916)
Colnbrook Chemical & Explosives Co ld (petn of Scottish Tube Co ld—s o from July 25, 1916, to Oct 24, 1916)
British Improved Construction Co ld (petn of M Bowles-Evans—s o from July 25, 1916, to Oct 24, 1916)
Provincial Investment & Guarantee Co ld (petn of T H Denman)
Landore Plasmarl & District Permanent Money Soc (petn of D Lewis)

King Insee Co ld (petn of Commercial Union Assee Co ld)
Christchurch Settlement Pioneer Fund ld (petn of H F R Engelhardt)
Richmond Delicacies ld (petn of the Company)
J B Clay & Allan ld (petn of Dickens & Cooper ld)
British Murac Syndicate ld (petn of J Joyce)
Ralph & Sewell ld (petn of Brown Bros ld)
Morris Bros ld (petn of M Seigel)
Pictureland Vendors ld (petn of J Slater)
Edmonton Land Syndicate ld (petn of Canadian Agency ld—in Liquidation)

Chancery Division.

Petition (to confirm Re-organisation of Capital).

Cooper Steam Digger Co ld (ordered on June 15, 1914, to stand over generally)

Petitions (to confirm Reduction of Capital).

Filisola Rubber & Produce Estates ld and reduced (ordered on July 18, 1916, to stand over generally)

Cosens & Co ld and reduced (s o from July 25, 1916, to Oct. 17, 1916)

Rubber & Enterprise Syndicate ld and reduced

Central Mining & Investment Cor n ld and reduced

Petition (to sanction Scheme of Arrangement).

William Coleman's Ordinary Shares ld (petn of H W Cutting—ordered on March 3, 1914, to stand over generally)

Companies (Winding Up).
Petition (to Sanction Scheme of Arrangement).

United Electric Theatres ld (petn of the Company)—ordered on Aug 30, 1916, to stand over generally

Motions.

Aublet Harry & Co ld (to stay proceedings—s o from Aug 30, 1916, to Oct 12, 1916)

Law Life Assee Soc (for payment out of Companies Liquidation Account—ordered on Aug 30, 1916, to stand over generally)
Companies (Winding Up) and

Chancery Division.

Court Summonses.

French South African Development Co ld Partridge v French South African Development Co ld (on preliminary point)—ordered on April 2, 1914, to stand over generally pending trial of action in King's Bench Division

English & Scottish American Mortgage & Investment Co ld (as to contingent claims—part heard—parties to apply to fix day for further hearing)

Insu Mining & Development Syndicate ld (misfeasance)—with witnesses

Sharpe, Ross & Co ld (on proof of Old Lodge Tinplate Co ld)

Consolidated Diesel Engine Manufacturers ld (claim to dividend placed to Suspense Account)

Omnium Insee Corp n ld (liberty to reinsure)

Essex Wood & Hide Co ld (to stay execution)

Before Mr. Justice Evr.
Retained Witness Action.

Thomas v Buckland

Further Consideration.

In re J M Marsden, dec Marsden v Marsden

Causes for Trial without Witnesses and Adjourned Summonses.

In re Francisco Suarez Suarez v Saurez

In re an Arbitration between M S Langa and ors and J Caird and anr

In re an Application by Williams ld, No. 369,247, and In re the Opposition of Cadbury Bros ld and ors, and In re The Trade Marks Act, 1905

Stephenson, Blake & Co v Grant, Legros & Co ld

In re Blake, dec Gawthorne v Blake

In re M Travers, dec Hurmson v Carr

In res W Jones, dec James v Lewis

In re C J Homer, dec Cowlishaw v Rendell

In re Morgan-Brown, dec Morgan-Brown v Morgan-Brown

In re William Woolgar, dec Gates v Woolgar

In re C F Sykes, dec Roberts v Sykes

In re Mitford's Settled Estates Mitford v Mitford

In re G A Mankiewicz, dec Foxwell v Dickinson

In re L Gwynne, dec Barnard v Yates

In re W Purvis, dec In re M Purvis, dec Purvis v Churnside

In re an Application by Barlow & Jones ld, In re The Trade Mark Act, 1905

In re Wren, dec Riecke v Macdonald

In re Walford, dec The Public Trustee v Walford

In re Muhlenkamp Stone v Muhlenkamp

In re McCloy, dec, and In re Trustee Act, 1893

In re Bruce Durand v Bruce

In re Cowlin Rayner v Moss

In re Brockbank Helder v Brockbank

In re Brown Wood v Bunting

In re Cooper Maitland v Cooper

In re Vawdry Mercer v Nash

In re Escombe Escombe v Escombe

In re Wilson Pott v Wilson

In re Kent Kedge v Mitchinson

In re Walmsley & Shaw's Contract

THE HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN,

GREAT ORMOND STREET, LONDON.

ENGLAND'S greatest asset is her Children.

This Hospital finds itself hampered for want of funds to enable it, by saving infant life, to exert greater effort to counterbalance the drain of War upon the manhood of the Nation.

Read what the Men at the Front say:—

"I beg to enclose a cheque for £22 as a gift to the Great Ormond Street Children's Hospital from the Honourable Artillery Company, being the proceeds of a collection made at the Front. I trust the noble work of the Hospital goes on apace."

"It would have cheered you to see how generously the Officers and Men emptied their pockets in response to the call of the children at home; for nearly every soldier has something of the child's heart in him."

Will you also please remember "the call of the Children."

Forms of Gift by Will to this Hospital can be obtained on application to—

JAMES McKAY, Acting Secretary.

In re Whitbread Whitbread v Peilham
In re Maunder Till v Dean
In re Wyatt Cockburn v Wyatt
In re Cooke The Public Trustee v Black
In re L'Estrange, dec Melock v Burges
Borwick v Croft
In re Winn, dec Teasdale v Winn
In re Upton, dec Silversides v Upton
In re Woodhouse, dec Woodhouse v Woodhouse
In re Coslett, dec Coleman v Attorney-Gen
In re Jackson Waller v Jackson Liddell v Winther
Aaron v Wandby
In re Caton Nelson v Vatcher Coombs v Quincy
In re Browne The Public Trustee v Browne
In re Bayly Bayly v Arman
In re Bayly Bayly v Bayly
Brinsley v Cook
In re Castellon Oil Co ld Sutton v The Company
In re Markham Markham v Markham
Dyson v Peat

Before Mr. Justice SARGANT.

Retained Matters.

Further Considerations.

In re Becket, dec In re Southgate, dec Watson v Southgate (s o)

In re Hoare, dec Hoare v Strickland

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Hoare Hoare v Strickland
In re Ailesbury, dec Binney v Ailesbury

In re Sir James Rankin's Settled Estate In re Settled Land Acts
In re Lady Bertie of Thame's Settlement Booth v Bertie
In re Chrimes, dec Locovich v Chrimes

In re Williams' Agreement In re W R Williams, dec Sale v Williams

Causes for Trial.

(With Witnesses.)

In re J S Thompson, dec In re The Trustee Act, 1893 Randall v Thompson

Cowper and anr v Gronous and anr
Gardner v Ystradowen Colliery Co ld

In the Matter of Ralph Hancock's Patent, No 21,353 of 1913, and In the Matter of the Patents and Designs Acts, 1907 and 1908 (not before Oct 19)

Horton v Rhyl Urban District Council (to be in List Oct 17)

In the Matter of Letters Patent granted to William Tranton, dated Oct 29, 1902, No 23,642 (to be in List Oct 16)

Joicey v Moore
Carter v Bennett

In re D Morley, dec Wyatt and anr v Dana and anr

Grenfell v Leighton
Jellett v Trim

Napier v Palladium Autocars ld
St George v Radcliffe

Green v The Eastern Palm Estates, &c Syndicate

The British Thomson Houston Co ld v The A and A Electrical Co ld

Mills v City & County Private Finance Co ld

Searle v San Carlos Gold Mining Co ld

Hoare v Morgan
United Counties Bank v Heygate
Enlayde ld v Roberts
Smith v Incorporated Society of Licensed Victuallers
Attorney-Gen v Hemingway
Boardman v Tellwright
Leyton Urban District Council v Wright
Boulton v Burslem & Tunstall
Permanent £50 Building Soc
Army & Navy Contract Corpn v Bleriot
Rees v Ynysammon Colliery Co
Gibbons v London Theatres of Varieties Co
Williment v Langford
In re David Stevens, dec Legg v Stevens
Raines v Wylam
The Land Drainage (Lincoln West S District) Board v Kirk
In re Grant, dec Grant v MacDonald
Hooper v Naish
Neale v Maconochie
In re Stephens Stephens v Williams
In re Same Same v Same
Rutters v Popham
In re Radford Groves v Radford
Grantway v Perkins
Ambrose v Partridge
Bedford Charity v The New Theobalds Cinema ld

Before Mr. Justice ASTBURY.

Retained Matters.

Adjourned Summonses.

In re M A Brewster, dec Butler v Graham

In re Roach Gameson v Roach
In re J H Barry, dec Smart v Snell

In re Kershaw The Halifax Commercial Banking Co v Kershaw

In re E B Titley, dec Union of London & Smiths Bank v Titley

Petition.

In re Sullivan's Trusts

Causes for Trial.

(With Witnesses.)

Clementi-Smith v Wyman & Sons ld

Chapman v Curtice

Ham v Lake

Meeking v Meeking

In re J McCarthy, dec Mullings v Gurney

Mudge v Penge Urban District Council

Hastie v Whitehurst
In re Ellen Marshall, dec Everett v Spencer

Webster v Bakewell Rural District Council

Slazengers ld v C Gibbs & Co

Stern v Stout

Rush v Rush

Gray v Hansley

London Theatres of Varieties ld v Gibbon

In re Phillips, dec Phillips v Rosenthal

Nash v Harris

Verdier v Alexander

Caple v Gunn

Simpson v Salomon

Fenton v F Lawrence ld

The Profits & Income Insc Co ld v Hyman

Bradford v Herman

Smallpiece v Kingston

Wyllie v Wyllie

Beckett v Coxhead

British Thomson Houston Co ld v Duram ld

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY

LIMITED.

No. 15, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1861.

Capital Stock £400,000

Debiture Stock £331,130

REVERSIONS PURCHASED. ADVANCES MADE THEREON.

Forms of Proposal and full information can be obtained at the Society's Office.

G. H. MAYNE, Secretary.

Carter v Hungerford
Paine v Ward (Brighton District Registry)

Before Mr. Justice YOUNGER.

Retained Witness Actions.

Southgate v Southgate
In re E Turrall, dec Turrall v Turrall pt hd

Faraday v Tamworth Union pt hd
Poole's Theatres ld v Arnold Perrett & Co ld, International

Electric Theatres ld, third parties

Chetham, Sons & Bifen v The Mayor, &c, of Bradford

Société Anonyme des Usines Remy v Becker

Harris v Emery

Moody v Cox & Hall pt hd

Causes for Trial without Witnesses and Adjourned Summonses.

In re Salmon Salmon v Lambert (to be mentioned Oct. 13)

In re Trading with the Enemy (Amendment) Act, 1914 In re Fried Krupp AG, an enemy

within the Act pt hd

In re Arnsby's Trusts Mortimer v William Hughes ld pt hd (s o to Nov 15)

In re Charles Davis, dec Preston v Phillips

In re Crosse, dec Cleeve v Crosse

In re W Cooper's Trusts Townsend v Townsend

In re Jehu's Settlement Winn v Smith

In re Cavendish Browne's Trusts Horner v Rawle

In re Butlin, dec Butlin v Butlin

In re Annie White, dec Woodbridge v White

In re J Daglish, dec Fawdon v King

In re H M Bennett Bennett v Bruce

In re R A McLean, dec McLean v McLean

In re T R Legg's Settlement Legg v Equitable Reversionary Investment Soc

In re T Clark, dec Clayton v Clark

Baillie v Neville Preston v Neville

In re Herbert Spencer, dec Duncan v The Geological Soc

In re Robert Menzies, dec Royal Exchange Assce v Menzies (with witnesses)

In re W J L Morgan, dec Public Trustee v Morgan

Davies v Powell Duffryn Steam Coal Co question of law

Cloughton v Brockhouse

Before Mr. Justice PETERSON.

Retained Matters.

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Gould's Will Worsley v Barrett pt hd (s o)

In re Etherton, dec Clarke v Cole pt hd (s o)

In re Price, dec Stanborough v Price pt hd (s o)

In re Hepworth Arthur v Arthur (to come on with a motion)

British Power, Traction and Lighting Co ld v Hodgson

Motion.

The Annexe Syndicate ld v The Motor Petrol Syndicate

Causes for Trial.

(With Witnesses.)

In re Niel Rylie ld Harben v Niel Rylie ld

Caswell v London City and Midland Bank

The Alpertown Rubber Co v Manning

Black Mountain Silica Co v Colliery Investment Trust

Webb v Chandler

The Winning Post (1906) ld v The Palace Theatre ld

Phillips v The Manufacturers Soc ld

In re an Appln, No. 365,888, by the Havana Commercial Co and in re an opposition, No. 6,017, by George Wilkes and In re

Trade Marks Act, 1903

Batany v Charron ld

Lupton v Wood

Liverpool Corpn v W Muirhead & Co ld

In re Butcher, dec Buckthought v Pownall

Cass v Jackson

Whitefield v Hooper

Simmons v Bodinestone

In re F J Mitchell, dec Benham v Lascelles

Davis v Davis

In re Hollebone, dec Bligh v Edell

Meggeson v Groves

Godfrey and ors v Luton Dyeing, &c, Co

In re F Currey, dec Currey v Currey

The Scottish Provident Institution Buildings ld v W Cubitt & Co

Dick v Norton

Graham v Killick

Pickering v Pickering

Battersby v Whiteley

Northbourne v Davis

Goodwin v Stevenson

Law v Harrigan

In re Floyd, dec Collins v Floyd

Snell v Sutton

In re Hale, dec Hale v Hale

Reversionary v The Public Trustee

McClane v Bishop

Armitage v Cohen

Cohen v Armitage

Ashby v Edwards

Melville v Fairweather

In re Gulston, dec Anderson v Smurthwaite

Austin v Austin

Tingley v Müller

Torres v Torres

Mathieson v Napier.

British Reinforced Concrete Engineering Co ld v Lind

Atkinson v James

Norman v Norman

Swinbourn v Devenham
Jones v Cook-Hill's Trustees
Fowler v Midland Electric Corp
Chaproniere v Lambert
Mackee v Pratt
Goodman v Whitfield
Elder v Frew
Oldridge v Maskelyne

General Supplies Co ld v M Myers
& Son ld
Hughes v Hughes
Shaw v Seladon Motor, &c, Co ld
Hart v Gething
Nickelsburg & Co ld v D T Jack-
son & Co Gerhard & Hey ld v
Same

CIVIL - PAPER.

For Argument.

London United Tramways ld v London County Council
Schirm & anr v Consolidated Whaling & Deep Sea Fishing Co of
South Africa
Alexander & Duncan ld v Davies
Nunn v Bradstreet & Sons
Wortley v Mann
Southcombe Bros v Smith
Brown, Hughes & Co v Fellows
Stead v Sheffield & South Yorkshire Navigation
Brett v Bird & anr
Sharp Bros & Knight v Chant
Osborne v Great Central Ry Co
Alder v Same
Higgs v Ayre & Kingcome ld
Williams & anr v Williams
Evans v Iredell
Wayman v Perseverance Lodge of the Cambridgeshire Order of United
Brethren Friendly Soc & ors
Asplen v Pullin
Ascher v Morgan
Barnett v Finn
Carnegie & Co v Franklin
Lorden v Kean
Midland Ry Co v Warners Sons & Co
Groves v Western Mansions
Woods & anr v Williams (Easun 3rd party)
Halter v Mayor, &c, of West Ham
Green v Bolton
Graham v Miller
Burcombe v Barnes
Kitts & Murray, Joseph Wiles & Con v W Cater & Co
Turner v Coates
Palmer v Ward
Jarvis v Adams
Electric & Ordnance Accessories Co v Ford
Kitchen v Hardwicke
McMillan & Co v Alliance Trades Protection Assoc
Caney v Hudson
Maple & Co v Thomas
Sutton v Parker
Lovell v Sander
Madgwick v Fryer
Ross v Goddard
Gatehouse v Shaw & ors
Barker v Wright & Son
Couchman v Andrew
Sales Agency v Elite Theatres (Rose, Clmt)
Fontana v Owen
Holgate v Bleazard
Ashton & Sons v Ellenwad Spinning Co
Clark v Flatau & Co
Lundberg & Co v Witting & Partners
Geldard v Bleazard & Sons
Squire v Adams & Watts
Sury v Dering & anr
Riley v Gill
Healy v Howlett & Sons
Nott v Lord Mayor, &c, of Cardiff
Caicedo v Spectermans
Bunce v Burman
Lawrence v Barber
Marshall v Athenaeum Bldgs (Sunderland) ld
Jordan Gaskell v Day
Lewis v Penrikyber, &c, Colliery Co

KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1916.

CROWN PAPER.

For Judgment.

The King v Supt. Registrar of Marriages, Hammersmith (c.a.v. Sept. 21,
1916)

For Argument.

The King v Beverley U D C
Dreyfus & Co. v Ollier.
Webb v Baker.
Rowe Bros & Co v Crossley Bros
Curzon v Mayor, &c, of Westminster
The King v Tribunal of Appeal under London Building Act
Blaydon Co-operative Soc v Young
The King v Westminster Assessment Committee & anr
Vecsey v Smith.
Corpn of London v Wolff
London County Council v Galsworthy
The King v Justices of Lindsey, Lincolnshire & Walker
Ford & Co v Oliefabricken Het Haart en De Zwaan ofh Adriaan Honig
Burbury v Jackson
The King v Proprietors, Publishers, &c, of the Graphic Newspaper
The Victoria Pier (Folkestone) Syndicate v Reeve
The King v Kensington Income Tax Commrs
The King v Abingdon Income Tax Commrs
The King v Westminster Union
Onions v Clarke
Kaye v Cole
Brighton-Shoreham Aerodrome ld v Dell
Peirano & Co & ors v Directors of Liverpool Corn Trade Assoc
Cox v Evans
The King v Registrar of Pontefract County Court & anr
The King v City of London Income Tax Commrs
The King v Kensington Income Tax Commrs
Jones & ors v Hatherton & ors
Newman v Foster.
Fowler & Co (Leeds) v Hunslet Union & ors
Jones v Ennion
Towler v Sutton
Daventry Union v Coventry Union
Woods v Vansittart
Pierson v Altrincham U.D.C.
Fox v Spicer
In the Matter of a Solicitor expte The Law Soc
Same v Same
The King v Governor of Walton Prison, Liverpool
Dale v London County Council
Gill & anr v Carson
Ini Bros & Co v Linton Mills Manufacturing Co
Lea Bridge District Gas Co v Malvern
Rhymney Iron Co v Gelligear U D C
Denniss & Co v Hepworth Bros
Atkinson v Recruiting Officer for Bury St. Edmunds

W. WHITELEY, LTD.,

AUCTIONEERS, EXPERT VALUERS, AND ESTATE AGENTS,

QUEEN'S ROAD, LONDON, W.

VALUATIONS FOR PROBATE

ESTATE DUTY, SALE, FIRE INSURANCE, &c.

AUCTION SALES EVERY THURSDAY, VIEW ON WEDNESDAY,

LONDON'S LARGEST SALEROOM.

PHONE No. : PARK ONE (40 LINES).

TELEGRAMS: "WHITELEY, LONDON."

Skinner v Cadwell
Hudson & anr v Bray
Barnes v John Barnett Id
Tiptaft & Son v Sawyer & Sons
Leicestershire Dairy Farmers, &c, Soc v Hollingshead
Walker v Crabb
Novinsky v Setter
Duckworth v Wilkes & anr (Sweeting, Clmt)
Joyce v Lord Ebury & ors
Cwmgorse Brick Co v Davies
Sinden v Bisi
Lewis & Co v Dobell
Scott v Wing
Embiricos & ors v Embiricos
Harris v Ocean Coal Co
Gainsford v Stockdale

MOTIONS FOR JUDGMENT.

Leese, Hale & Co v Jenkins
Same v Same

SPECIAL PAPER.

London United Tramways v London County Council
Same v Same
Anglo-Chinese Trading Co v Produce Brokers' Co.
Nott v Cardiff Corp.
Wigan Coal, &c, Co v Hayes
Dexters v Fischel & Co.
Fumagalli v Nye & Jenks Grain Co.

REVENUE PAPER.

English Information.

Attorney-Gen. and John Henry Oglander & anr.

Cases Stated.

Marion Brooke and Commrs. of Inland Revenue (c.a.v.)
Duke of Buccleuch & Queensberry and Commrs. of Inland Revenue
W. R. Shore (Surveyor of Taxes) and the National Provincial Bank of
England Id.

Petitions under the Licensing (Consolidation) Act, 1910.

Walker & Homfrays Id. & ors. and The Commrs. of Inland Revenue
(re The "Cheshire Cheese," Leigh)
Chesters Brewery Co. Id. and The Commrs. of Inland Revenue (re "The
Land o' Cakes," Hillgate, Stockport)
Florence Elsie Bennett and The Commrs. of Inland Revenue (re "The
Stork Hotel," Hotwell Road, and "The Tap," Cumberland Place,
Bristol)

Petitions under Finance Act, 1894.

In the Matter of the Estate of the Hon. Charles Thomas Mills, dec.
In the Matter of the Estate of James Crossley Eno, dec

Death Duties.

In the Matter of the Estate and Effects of Mary Brown or Harper, dec
Motion.

Motion for judgment—Attorney-Gen. and E. Zellermeier (s.o.)

Special Case under R. S. C., Order 34.

The Commrs. of Land Tax for the East Riding of the County of York,
&c, and The Earl of Lonsborough

APPEALS AND MOTIONS IN BANKRUPTCY.

Appeals from County Courts to be heard by a Divisional Court sitting
in Bankruptcy, Pending 4th October, 1916.

In re A Debtor (No. 7 of 1916) v Expte. The Debtor v the Petitioning
Creditors & The Official Receiver appl. from the County Court of
Surrey (Guildford and Godalming)
In re C. Gordon Marquis of Huntly (No. 3 of 1909) v Expte. Isaac
Goldstein v H. W. Cox, the Trustee appl. from the County Court of
Northamptonshire (Peterborough)
In re J. H. Graham (No. 37 of 1908) v Expte. H. K. Armstrong, the
Trustee v. Charles John Potter appl. from the County Court of
Northumberland (Newcastle-upon-Tyne)

MOTIONS IN BANKRUPTCY FOR HEARING BEFORE THE
JUDGE, PENDING 4TH OCTOBER, 1916.

In re J. Phillips v Expte. The Official Receiver, Trustee v The Retail
Dairymen's Mutual Id.
In re R. Blitz v Expte. A. Charlesworth, the Trustee v Mrs Reynolds,
formerly Mrs. Blitz widow of R. Blitz, dec.
In re Lord Edward Fitzgerald v Expte. W. B. Hobbs v F. S. Salaman,
the Trustee
In re G. F. M. Cornwallis-West v Expte. F. S. Salaman, the Trustee
v B. S. Cornwallis-West, G. L. Whately & F. W. Lewis
In re F. Davies v Expte. The Debtor v Mrs. Aileen Daisy Baker

The Property Mart.

Forthcoming Auction Sale.

Oct. 30.—Messrs. HAMPTON & SONS, at the Mart: Freehold Residence (see adver-
tisement, back page, this week).

Winding-up Notices.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 29.

CRU'OL CHEMICALS, LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on
or before Oct 20, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts
or claims, to Thomas Smethurst, 26, Pall Mall, Manchester, liquidator.

INTERNATIONAL BLEACHERS' CORPORATION, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before
Nov 6, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims,
to Harry Hackett, 44, Bedford row, liquidator.

PRATTINATURA ITALIANA, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 1, to send their
names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Paton,
3, Piccadilly, Bradford, liquidator.

STANDARD UNION TRUST, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 20, to send
their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Warwick
Geoffrey Travers Pemberton, liquidator, care of Freshfields, 31, Old Jewry, Solicitors.

SYNTHETIC MILK SYNDICATE, LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are re-
quired, on or before Nov 4, to send their names and addresses, and the particu-
lars of their debts or claims, to John Garland Godwin, 195, Strand, liquidator.

VILERO SYNDICATE, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 15, to send their
names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles William
Moore, 5, London Wall bldgs, liquidator.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 3.

CAMP CATERING CO, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 16, to send their
names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Leonard Arthur
Reddall, J., Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st, liquidator.

GABI, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 15, to send in their names
and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Raymond Cecil Taylor,
195, Strand, liquidator.

HUGHES & PARK, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 3, to send their names and
addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Harold Sadler, 31, North
John st, Liverpool, liquidator.

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ESTABLISHED IN 1890.

LICENSES INSURANCE.

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

Upwards of 750 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision of the Corporation.
Suitable Clauses for insertion in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent on
application.

POOLING INSURANCE.

The Corporation also insures risks in connection with FIRE, CONSEQUENTIAL LOSS,
BURGLARY, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION, FIDELITY GUARANTEE, THIRD PARTY, &c., under
a perfected Profit-sharing system.

APPLY FOR PROSPECTUS.



ning
t of
saac
rt of
the
t of

THE
etail
olds,
man,
ustee

dver-

, on
lebia
efore
lms,
their
aton,
send
wick
ra.
e re-
ticu-
their
llam

their
thur
ames
ylor,
and
orth

E

n.
us

K